

Application No. 10/718,119
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 3-4, as amended, are pending in this application. Claims 1-2 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. Claims 3-4 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants respectfully request that the Amendment After Final be entered in accordance with 37 CFR §116 and MPEP 714.13 since: (1) no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment; (2) the Amendment resolves all issues raised by the Examiner in the Final Office Action; (3) the subject matter of the Amendment already has been included in the Examiner's search and therefore does not require the Examiner to perform further searching; (4) the Amendment places the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal, (5) the Amendment does not result in a net addition of claims to the application, and (6) the Amendment could not have been presented earlier since it responds to a new ground of rejection made in the final rejection. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Telephone Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview conducted on January 4, 2006 in which Applicant's attorney of record explained the previously provided Proposed Amendment to Claims 3 and 4. Based on the discussion, the Examiner suggested that claims 3 and 4 be copied into the specification at the appropriate place and that the proposed amendments to claims 3 and 4 be submitted in the amendment after final.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 3-4 to clarify that the differences between the heights of the projections are less than 40 μm . The amended claims are supported by the description of the nineteenth embodiment starting at pages 209 -218 and Figs.

Application No. 10/718,119
Reply to Office Action of October 7, 2005

69 and 70, wherein the projections are shown as elements 551 and 552 and the rubber ring is shown as elements 571 and 572. In view of the foregoing Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of § 112 rejection of claims 3 and 4

Amendment to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification at page 209 with the subject matter of claims 3 and 4.

CONCLUSION

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections have been addressed, the application is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 3-4 is therefore earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner choose to issue an advisory action, Applicant respectfully requests that prior thereto, the Examiner telephone the undersigned at the telephone number indicated to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,


KIYOSHI MASAKI ET AL.

By:


LOUIS SICKLES II
Registration No. 45,803
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1294
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS